

about ObamaCare the way he did. He is neglecting the facts. I will only repeat a few of them.

No. 1, there are 17 million people who now have health insurance who didn't. Using his own numbers, he said: One out of every five people who went to the emergency room in Kentucky had insurance, private insurance. Four-fifths of them had no insurance. They have it now. That says it all.

Rather than cut Medicare and cut Medicaid, as in the Republican budget—they should not be doing that. The reason there are long waiting lines is because Republicans are not helping us fund Medicare and Medicaid in an appropriate fashion.

The late Senator Ted Kennedy once said: "An essential part of our progressive vision is an America where no citizen of any age fears the cost of health care."

We are not there yet, but since the Affordable Care Act became law, that vision has become more of a reality every day. The facts are indisputable. Health care costs are growing at a historically low rate.

The overall health of Americans is improving, and health care providers are now finding innovative ways to reduce health care spending while improving the quality of care that patients have.

Last week, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that a key pilot program created by the Affordable Care Act saved Medicare almost \$400 million in 2 years. This is good news.

The Pioneer accountable care organization model was launched by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in an effort to improve health care delivery and payment options.

An independent evaluation of this model shows an average of about \$300 in savings per beneficiary every year. Rather than being a model, it should cover all patients. Right now this model is serving more than 600,000 Americans.

The idea is called accountable care. Accountable care organizations tie provider reimbursements to quality metrics and reductions in the total cost of care for patients—better care, less costs.

What is most remarkable about this program is that huge savings are being achieved without threatening the quality of care the patients receive. In fact, the quality of care is improving.

Medicare beneficiaries within the Pioneer accountable care organization model have reported more timely care and improved communication with the health care providers. They now have an ability to understand what is happening to their health care. Their questions are being answered. These patients use inpatient hospital services less and have fewer tests and have fewer procedures. That is what it is all about.

Last week's announcement shows that the Affordable Care Act is working, to the tune of \$400 million.

Can you imagine the impact this pilot program will have on health care costs when it is expanded? It is true that we have more work to do to ensure quality affordable health care for every American. These reports show Senator Kennedy's vision for America's health care system is beginning to become a reality.

Mr. President, would you be kind enough to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see no one on the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF JOE DUNN

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to honor Cascade County Deputy Sheriff Joe Dunn, a dedicated public servant who died in the line of duty on August 14, 2014.

On behalf of all Montanans, I want to thank Deputy Dunn for his service to our Nation and to the community of Great Falls, MT. Before enlisting to serve and protect his neighbors as a deputy sheriff, Joe Dunn served our Nation in the U.S. Marine Corps and deployed to the battlefields of Afghanistan.

Upon returning to Montana, Deputy Dunn married the love of his life, Robynn. They had two children, Joey and Shiloh, who were the center of his universe. Deputy Dunn's deep commitment to Jesus and his love for his family were the guiding principles in which he lived his life.

Montana's leaders have permanently honored the life and service of Deputy Dunn by naming an 8-mile stretch of Interstate 15 outside of Great Falls, MT. It is named the Joseph J. Dunn Memorial Highway.

On May 15, 2015, Peace Officers Memorial Day, Deputy Dunn's name will be enshrined forever alongside 273 other brave peace officers who were killed in the line of duty.

During his lifetime of service, Deputy Dunn always went beyond the call of duty to ensure the safety of those he

served, often working the evening shift and long hours away from his family. Deputy Dunn always put others above himself, and he is the kind of leader every Montanan can be proud of.

Everyone who knew Deputy Dunn has been touched by his commitment to serve others and his passion for making his community a better place to call home. But above all, Joe Dunn was a family man. Regardless of the length of his shift or the difficulty of his day, his top priority was that of being a father.

Today, as a body, we offer our deepest thoughts and prayers to his family, Robynn, Joey, and Shiloh. The State of Montana and this country are endlessly grateful for his service.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1295 and H.R. 644 en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

A bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Service of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1223 AND 1224

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Hatch amendments, amendment No. 1223 to H.R. 1295 and amendment No. 1224 to H.R. 644, are considered and agreed to.

(The amendment (No. 1223) in the nature of a substitute is printed in the RECORD of May 13, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

(The amendment (No. 1224) in the nature of a substitute is printed in the RECORD of May 13, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, at this moment, we begin the debate on one of the most important bills to come in front of the Senate this year, to guarantee that Americans can find a more level playing field as we compete in the world economy to show that Americans should not be patsies for other countries that are cheating and altering records and information they submit to trade authorities.

This is an opportunity to close an 85-year-old loophole that has allowed us to import products produced by slave labor and child labor and to fix our currency system so countries and their companies, especially in East Asia and South Asia—mostly East Asia—cannot continue to cheat and sell into our country with a bonus and penalize us when we try to sell our products to their countries.

This body delivered one strong message this week which was unprecedented. I can't think of the last time the Senate spoke with such an emphatic voice on a trade issue. The simple message: We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement.

We should not be passing new agreements while doing nothing, which the Senate tried to do on Tuesday, but the Senate stood up and said no. We should not be passing new agreements while doing nothing to enforce existing laws and support American companies dealing with unfair competition.

We need to stand up particularly for our small businesses, which are always hurt to a much greater degree than large businesses. When a large company in Cleveland, Toledo or Lima shuts down production and moves overseas to Xi'an, Beijing or Wuhan, China, so they can get a tax break from our government—amazingly enough, this body will not close that tax loophole—and sell products back to our country, that company's bottom line may be a bit better, but the supply chain for those large companies—the companies in our communities in Lima, Toledo, Mansfield, and Wooster—that sell to those big companies have lost their biggest customers in far too many cases. Those businesses go out of business, those workers get laid off, those plants close, and we know what happens. That is why we especially need to stand up for those small businesses that play by the rules and are drowning from a set of imports from countries that manipulate their currency and practice illegal dumping. Dumping is when companies subsidize water, capital, land, labor costs or other inputs, such as energy, and sell under the real cost of production into the United States—that kind of illegal dumping.

It is one thing to talk about statistics, but I want to stop and think about the costs of imports to our companies, communities, and families.

In the State of Pennsylvania, as the Presiding Officer knows, especially between Pittsburgh and Philly or Western Pennsylvania, the area I am more

familiar with because I represent the adjoining State, we see time after time companies in small towns—when a company shuts down in a place like Jackson, OH, or Chillicothe, OH, so often because of the size of the town, both the husband and wife each lose their jobs because they both work at that company, their entire family income is wiped out, and they are likely to lose their home to foreclosure. We know all of those problems that happen because we don't enforce our trade rules. That is why I want us to stop and think about the real costs to families, communities, and companies.

In Ohio, we have seen how dumping by Korean companies has hurt our steel industry. Neither President Bush nor President Obama has stepped up on trade the way each had promised in their campaigns, and neither has stepped up the way that they should to preserve our workers, our businesses, and our livelihoods. We both promised, on Korea, thousands—that there would be tens of thousands of new jobs, billions in increased exports for our companies. Yet the reality of the Korea trade agreement was absolutely the opposite of that. We had major job loss and a major loss in the import-export ratio because of that South Korea trade agreement they pushed on the U.S. Congress, and the people here too willingly passed.

Natural gas production has increased demand. I will explain Korea for a moment. Natural gas production has increased demand for the world-class tubular steel made in plants such as U.S. Steel in Lorain, Youngstown, and Trumbull County. Tubular steel is the steel piping that is particularly strong and durable. It is subjected to great pressure and great heat as they drill for natural gas—in so-called fracking—or they drill for oil.

Mr. President, 8,000 workers in 22 States make these Oil Country Tubular Goods. Each one of those jobs supports another seven positions in the supply chain. We know when we talk about manufacturing, it is never just the manufacturing jobs, as important as they are, it is the jobs in the entire supply that go into the assembly of the airplane or the automobile or the steel production of Oil Country Tubular Goods. These producers increasingly lose business to foreign competitors that are not playing by the rules. Imports for OCTG, Oil Country Tubular Goods, have doubled since 2008. By some measures, imports account for somewhat more than 50 percent of the pipes being used by companies drilling for oil and gas in the United States.

Korea has one of the world's largest steel industries, but get this, not one of these pipes that Korea now dumps in the United States—illegally subsidized—is ever used in Korea for drilling because Korea has no domestic oil or gas production. In other words, Korea has created this industry only for exports and has been successful because they are not playing fair. So

their producers are exporting large volumes to the United States, the most open and attractive market in the world, at below-market prices. That is clear evidence that our workers and manufacturers are being cheated, and it should be unacceptable to the Members of this body. It hurts our workers, our communities, and our country. It is time to stop it.

I toured Lorain's best U.S. Steel plant in 2013 and saw the No. 6 quench and temper finishing line, which was part of a \$100 million expansion project.

The naysayers who talk about our country, workers, and businesses say we cannot compete because we are not up-to-date or our workers are not producing—all the whining from these naysayers who support these trade policies is insulting to our workers, insulting to our communities, and insulting to our small businesses. They say we are not modern enough.

Well, look at the investment. I have seen the \$100 million investment in Lorain, for instance, and what that means. The first time in the history of steel production in this world, ArcelorMittal workers created about 1 ton about 5 years ago. When they passed this threshold, 1 person-hour created 1 ton of steel. They are the most productive steelworkers in the world, working in the most productive steel company in the world.

The expansion project with Lorain's U.S. Steel plant was made possible, in part, because we were able to crack down on Chinese steel pipe imports that flooded the market with illegal and cheap products. They made this investment because we won that trade case. Then, along came Korea to again try to inflict the same damage on our producers and our workers. It is clear that once again we need to ensure that other Nations don't unfairly dump steel into the U.S. market.

Last year, I visited the same plant and joined in with workers, managers, and union leaders to send one message: It is time for America to stand up to these lawbreakers; pure and simple, strip it all away—these countries are lawbreakers.

Here is the bad news: In January, U.S. Steel—in part because of Korea's dumping—announced 614 temporary layoffs at the plant in Lorain on Lake Erie. Those layoffs began in March.

I spoke on the floor before about one of the U.S. steelworkers I met, Ryan, who has been out of work for weeks. He has four kids at home and doesn't know when or if he will be back at work. Will his home be foreclosed down the road if he can't go back to work? He has played by the rules. He has been living a responsible life, by taking care of his kids, paying his mortgage, engaged in the union and community as a good, strong, productive worker. There are hundreds more like Ryan in Lorain and around Ohio.

In March, Republic Steel in Lorain announced 200 temporary layoffs. I say

“temporary” because the company is hopeful that our government will enforce trade rules and that the dumping of steel will abate a bit.

TMK is one of the largest producers of oil country tubular goods in the world, with a facility in Brookfield, OH, north of Youngstown. Since 2008, the company has invested \$2 billion in their U.S. operations. They are keeping up on technology and modernizing their plant with very productive workers. But how do they compete with Korea or China or other nations that are cheating?

Other companies make similar investments to stay on the cutting edge, but instead of expanding production to keep up with increasing demand, these companies operate under tighter and tighter margins and lay off workers. Last week, TMK announced plans to reduce operating hours at three of its facilities and completely idled another one.

I visited Byer Steel in Cincinnati. I spoke with Mr. Byer just yesterday when I met with some steel company executives, many of them from small businesses like his, where I first announced the Level the Playing Field Act to his company in Cincinnati.

American companies—Byer, TMK, U.S. Steel, Republic Steel, so many others—know firsthand that they are not in a fair fight. These manufacturers across Ohio and all over our country suffer enough from unfair trade practices distorting the market. It is their workers who suffer even more. Think about what even a temporary layoff can do to a family. They are facing mounting bills, facing mounting uncertainty. They may have to start to turn to credit cards and payday lenders to get by, and then the downward spiral begins.

I don't think too many in this body who are dressed like this and who have good-paying jobs and titles and far too often an adoring staff end up—we don't think much about this, but think about the laid-off worker who has for 7 years—she and her husband have lived in Lorain, where I used to live, which is an industrial city west of Cleveland—they have lived in Lorain and paid their mortgage. They are involved in their kids' activities in soccer and school and go to the programs at school. They are living lives the way we hope they would. But then she loses her good-paying, 18-dollar-an-hour job. She has a mortgage she meets every month. She has bills she pays every month. Then she loses her job. She faces the uncertainty of what happens next, and she faces a sharply declined income. At some point, her kids understand their mom lost her job and their dad's hours have been cut back. Then they face the question—and this is what we don't think much about in this body, people who dress like us and make good incomes and have good benefits and have a staff who helps them—then she has to sit down with her kids and say: We may lose our home because

we can't keep up with these bills. It is not because they speculated, not because they stole, not because they are morally inadequate in some ways; simply because they lost their job.

My State—and the Presiding Officer's State is not too far behind this, I don't think—my State for 14 years in a row had more foreclosures than the year before. That is not because Ohioans are irresponsible; it is because Ohioans have lost so many of these manufacturing jobs. They were paying their bills and meeting their obligations and raising their kids, and then all of a sudden they couldn't.

So they have to face their 12-year-old daughter and say: Honey, we are going to have to move. We can't afford to keep this house anymore. I don't know where we are going to move. I don't know what school you are going to go to. I am sorry.

I don't think people around this place think very much about the human face of these kinds of decisions. That is why this is so important.

We can do something about this. When jobs are lost due to cheap, flooded, illegal imports and at the same time we aren't increasing our exports, we need to do all we can to stop this practice and protect our workers.

The other side will say we are increasing our exports. We are a bit, but the imports are much higher in almost every one of these cases. That is why we need to pass this Customs bill that incorporates the Level the Playing Field Act to crack down on foreign companies that are cheating. We welcome competition. We are a competitive country. We succeed in competing among ourselves and around the world. But it has to be fair; it has to be a level playing field. That is why the Level the Playing Field Act, title V of this Customs bill, is so very important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls be equally divided between the parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. President.

PATRIOT ACT

Today, I rise to express my long-standing concerns about the PATRIOT Act and in particular section 215, which is set to expire on June 1. A major use of this section—the bulk collection of Americans' phone records—has just been ruled illegal by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. If we didn't already have enough concern about reauthorizing section 215, this

decision should raise alarm bells. Yet, the majority leader is asking us to act quickly to reauthorize this law unchanged for another 5 years.

Without significant reforms to the law, I cannot support an extension of any length of time, and I urge my colleagues to listen to the court and listen to the numerous oversight groups from within the administration and the millions of citizens who are saying that Congress needs to rethink whether this program is violating our rights in the name of keeping us safe.

Ben Franklin was very fond of saying, “Those who give up liberty in the name of security deserve neither.” That is where we are today. Congress passed the PATRIOT Act over a decade ago after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Our Nation was devastated. Our security was at stake. But this legislation was hasty, it was far-reaching, and it undermined the constitutional right to privacy of law-abiding citizens. It still does.

I have made my opposition clear in the years since 2001. The major advocates of this law—primarily former President Bush and his key national security officials—used a potent combination of fear and patriotism to drive this bill through. I was one of only 66 Members to vote against the PATRIOT Act in the House of Representatives. I also voted against the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act in 2006 and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008.

In 2011, I opposed once again the extension of three controversial provisions of the PATRIOT Act: roving wiretaps, government access to “any tangible items,” such as library and business records, and the surveillance of targets that are not connected to any identified terrorist group.

Back in 2001, I said on the House floor that I was unable to support this bill because it does not strike the right balance between protecting our liberties and providing for the security of our citizens. I went on to say: The saving grace here is that the sunset provision forces us to come back and to look at these issues again when heads are cooler and when we are not in the heat of battle.

That is exactly what we should do. To govern in a post-9/11 world, we have to strike the right balance, to fight terrorism without trampling our Constitution. We can do both. The Bill of Rights was established immediately following a war. Our Founders knew the tension between freedom and security. Our Nation was founded on the right of individual liberty, in stark contrast to the long tradition of total sovereign authority of most other governments.

I strongly believe we should not force through a reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act without a hard look at the long-term ramifications of the law. We must look at how the law is being used for things such as the collection of all Americans' phone records. We must consider whether that use is necessary

to keep us safe and whether it is in line with the Constitutional rights we are sworn to uphold.

I urge our colleagues not to be swayed by the false argument that this provision must be reauthorized urgently, that we will be vulnerable to attack if we let it expire—another false argument.

Here is the reality. This provision is being used to sweep up the phone calls of all Americans across this country. Yet there is zero conclusive evidence that it has kept us safe from attack.

What we do have, however, is ample evidence that the PATRIOT Act, section 215, has been used to violate the privacy of everyday Americans. I believe it has violated the Constitution. I certainly agree with the Federal court of appeals which last week ruled that the bulk phone record collection goes far beyond what Congress intended when the law was passed.

We have a decade of hindsight. Let's be honest in this debate and let's be thorough. The entire law bears careful scrutiny. Senators LEE and LEAHY have introduced the USA FREEDOM Act to reform the law while reauthorizing the expiring provisions. I commend their efforts, but I think we can go even further.

The House also overwhelmingly passed its version of the USA FREEDOM Act just yesterday. It deserves Senate consideration. Congress has a duty for robust oversight, to ensure real constitutional privacy rights are upheld. I pushed for this from when I was in the House. I advocated then for the creation of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, also called PCLOB.

In June 2013, after details about NSA's bulk collection program were made public, I led a bipartisan call for the PCLOB to conduct an independent review. Their review assessed the impact of NSA's spying program on Americans' constitutional rights and civil liberties. The Board concluded what many Americans had feared: One, that the spying program is an unconstitutional intrusion on their privacy right, and, two, that it has almost no impact on safety.

The Board's oversight role is crucial. Its independent evaluation of section 215 demonstrates why. It has an important job, and it requires more support so it can do its job. That is why yesterday Senator WYDEN and I reintroduced the Strengthening Privacy, Oversight, and Transparency Act, or SPOT Act. Our bill, with bipartisan cosponsors in the House, would strengthen the Board. This is key to real oversight, and it should be included as part of any reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

The SPOT Act extends the Board's authority to play a watchdog role over surveillance conducted for purposes beyond counterterrorism. It also allows the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to issue subpoenas without having to wait for the Justice Department to issue them. It makes the Board member's positions full-time.

Finally, it makes the Board an authorized recipient for whistleblower complaints for employees in the intelligence community, so they can take concerns to an independent organization, one that understands the intelligence community. I know we must protect the Nation from future attacks. But there must also be balance. We cannot give up our constitutional protections in the name of security. To do so does not protect our Constitution nor does it increase our security.

We need to have a serious debate about these issues and allow Senators to offer amendments. This is important to the American people, to our security, and to our liberties. Congress cannot just leave town and leave this work undone.

I voted against the PATRIOT Act and the FISA Act amendments, because they unduly infringed on the guaranteed rights of our citizens. I believe that time has shown that to be true, and the time has come to correct it. We all value the work of our intelligence community. Their efforts are vital to our Nation's security. But I believe these amendments are crucial.

We can protect our citizens and their constitutional rights. We acted in haste before. It was a mistake then. It would be a mistake now to approve a straight reauthorization of that law. We need to take the time this time to get it right.

I see Senator WYDEN is on the floor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate is formally kicking off the trade debate here in the Senate. What I intend to do, starting today and in the days ahead, is to come back to what I think needs to be the central statement of this discussion; that is, the NAFTA playbook. The playbook for trade in the 1990s is gone. It is a new day in trade policy.

So I have summarized why the trade promotion act is not the trade policy of the 1990s and is not the North American Free Trade Agreement. What we are going to do today is essentially start with the question of how vigorous trade enforcement ought to be at the forefront of America's trade policy in 2015 and beyond, and how our new approach on enforcement is different than the policy of the 1990s.

The reality is, we can pass trade agreements full of lofty goals and principles. You can amass all of the enforcement ideas you might want, but it does not do any good if you do not have real enforcement tools and you make sure that they are not locked in a shed.

In my view, that has been happening for way, way too long. The status quo on trade enforcement simply no longer does the job. As I have listened for many months to Senators on both sides of the aisle, I believe there is widespread recognition that our approach to trade, particularly trade enforcement, has to change, because without

that change, we are not going to have the best possible path to creating more good-paying jobs for our people in a modern and globally competitive economy.

The bottom line is that those trade policies in the 1990s did very little—really nothing—to ensure strong enforcement of our trade laws to protect the American worker from the misdeeds of trade cheats. This bill is designed to take on the universe of aggressive tactics that our competitors have used. It upgrades trade enforcement laws to meet today's challenges.

What we have seen in recent years is that there are some overseas who play cat-and-mouse games with our Customs agents, using shell companies, fraudulent records, and sophisticated schemes. Then they bully—bully—American businesses into relocating factories and jobs or surrendering valuable intellectual property. Too often our companies are spied on, and trade enforcers may, in effect, be victimized by those who steal secrets and dodge accountability.

Our competitors often mask their activities by obscuring paper trails and perpetrating outright fraud. Now, our challenge—and I know my colleague the Presiding Officer has seen this as a member of the Finance Committee—is to get out in front of these schemes that I have just described. The enforcement legislation before the Senate is about guaranteeing that the United States has a queen on the chess board, no matter what competitive tactic it faces.

That starts with a proposal I first offered years ago called the ENFORCE Act. Now, the North American Free Trade Agreement did nothing to stop foreign companies that cheat and evade duties by concealing their identities and shipping their products on untraceable routes.

That is the way it used to be. That is why this legislation is not the North American Free Trade Agreement. The ENFORCE Act is going to give our Customs agents more tools aimed at cracking down on the behavior I have just outlined. Another major upgrade, something else that did not exist during those NAFTA days, is what I call an unfair trade alert. The new alert system would set off the warning bells long before the damage is done, when American jobs and exports come under threat.

One of the big fears we hear today is that our enforcers are incapable of stopping the trade cheats before it is too late. By the time somebody in Washington catches on to the newest unfair threat to undercut an American business, the plant has been shuttered, the factory lights are out, and the workers' lives have been turned upside down. In a lot of cases, if you are talking about the small towns that dot the landscape of Oregon and elsewhere, that abandoned facility might have been the beating heart of an entire community.

The slow pace of action in Washington, DC, should never be the reason Americans lose their jobs. The unfair trade alert—that was not part of the 1990s; that was not part of NAFTA. It is going to be part of our current policy today, helping our companies, helping our workers get there before it is too late.

Next, the Congress is going to lay down clear priorities for our trade enforcers, priorities that are centered on jobs and economic growth. There is going to be more accountability and follow-through baked into our enforcement system. In years past, trade debate in the Congress used to come down to a simple transaction of trade promotion authority for trade adjustment assistance.

What I said in developing this package of bills and what more than a dozen protrade Democrats said on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week was that the Senate needed to aim higher. The status quo was not good enough. In particular, it was not good enough in terms of enforcing the laws that are on the books. My guess is that in Pennsylvania and everywhere else—because I certainly hear it in Oregon—people say—particularly those of us who are protrade and want to tap these global markets: I hear you are talking about new trade agreements. How about enforcing the laws that are on the books?

What I started this morning—and I will be back again and again between now and the end of this debate—is to talk about why this is a very different approach than the approach taken in the 1990s. Tough, robust, effective enforcement of our trade laws is right at the core of a new and modern trade policy. It is a major part of what I call trade done right. It is how you guarantee that trade gives everybody in America a chance to get ahead.

Those are propositions, in my view, that deserve strong, bipartisan support in the Senate, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this trade enforcement law package.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic side have 20 minutes of the debate time remaining prior to noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to be able to equally divide the time spent in quorum calls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM FOR AUSTIN TICE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few minutes this morning

talking about a young man who can be described in many ways and one who has earned many accolades: decorated Marine Corps veteran, award-winning journalist, Houston native, and seventh-generation Texan. But most importantly, this young man, Austin Tice, is better known as a friend, brother, and son to loving and caring parents.

Almost 3 years ago, Austin decided to pause his law school studies to spend the summer in Syria as a freelance journalist. He was frustrated by the lack of reporting on Syria's civil war, a war that has claimed the lives of more than 300,000 people by some estimates—and that is just within the borders of Syria—and has displaced millions more who are living in refugee camps both in Syria and in surrounding countries. This huge refugee crisis affects many neighboring countries, such as Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon, and has tremendous potential to destabilize the entire region.

As a strong believer in freedom of the press, Austin wanted to let his fellow countrymen know what was going on in that part of the world. As a former Eagle Scout and Marine Corps captain, Austin's typical can-do attitude led him to decide that he should go to Syria himself and report on the civil war, and that is exactly what he did. Well, as with most things he tried, Austin proved to be very successful. While he was reporting from Syria, his work was published in the Washington Post, McClatchy news, and other outlets.

In August 2012, just days before he was planning to leave Syria, he was kidnapped, and no one has heard from him since. We still don't know for sure who his captors are. Sadly, we know very little. One thing we do know is that his parents, Marc and Debra Tice, and his entire family have worked tirelessly to locate him and to bring him home safely.

This week marks the 1,000th day of Austin's captivity. I really can't begin to imagine the toll this ordeal has taken on Austin's family, but I have to say I so greatly admire the courage and conviction of his parents, who said earlier this week in a statement:

We have desperately missed Austin for over 1,440,000 minutes—each new minute fuels our resolve to find him and bring him safely home.

While we often mark the number of days someone has been missing, it is important to remember that to the family and friends of someone who has been kidnapped, even the minutes that pass are almost unbearable. Austin's family is not just counting the days he has been gone and all the milestones he has inevitably missed, they are counting the minutes too.

Austin Tice has a family who is waiting for him, missing him, and laboring to find any piece of information that will lead to information about his whereabouts, while longing for his freedom. I join the Tice family in encour-

aging the Federal Government to do everything we can to possibly secure Austin's safe return home.

I also say once again to his family: We haven't given up. We will continue to stand by you, and we will never give up until we find your son and bring him safely home.

This week, we pass another milestone, this time of 1,000 days that Austin has been separated from his family. I join the Tice family in their hope that someday soon we will be able to add another milestone to this story, one that marks the day of his safe return to so many who love and miss him.

Today, our thoughts and prayers are with the Tice family, and I stand ready and I daresay all of us stand ready to do whatever we can to encourage and facilitate the return of this Texan, veteran, brother, and son.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on two pieces of important trade legislation. Both of these bills have been in the works for some time. They were among the four trade bills we reported out of the Senate Committee on Finance last month, and as a principal coauthor of both bills, I am very glad we found a way to get them to this point.

The first bill we will be voting on is the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015. This bill will reauthorize and improve three of our trade preference programs: the generalized system of preferences, or GSP; the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA; and tariff preferences for Haiti. I want to take a few minutes to talk about each of these programs individually, starting with the GSP.

The GSP promotes trade with developing nations by providing for non-reciprocal duty-free tariff treatment of certain products originating in those countries. The program helps beneficiary countries advance their economic development and encourages them to move toward more open economies and eliminate trade barriers to U.S. exports.

The GSP does more than provide assistance in the developing world; it also assists hundreds of businesses here in the United States. Across our country, manufacturers and importers benefit by receiving inputs and raw materials at a lower cost. Approximately three-quarters of U.S. imports under GSP are raw materials—parts and components—or machinery and equipment used by U.S. companies to manufacture goods here at home.

Unfortunately, because the program expired in 2013, many U.S. businesses

have had to deal with high tariffs on these imports for the last 2 years. As an example, last year alone, without the GSP program in place, American companies paid over \$600 million in tariffs. Businesses in every State have been affected by the expiration of GSP and have a vested interest in the renewal of the program. There are businesses in my own home State of Utah and around the country that have been left with difficult decisions about downsizing, hiring freezes, and employee layoffs in the absence of GSP. Today, with the passage of this bill, we will take a long-overdue step toward solving these problems.

Also included in the preferences bill are provisions for the long-term renewal of the AGOA Program, which encourages African countries to further develop their economies by lowering U.S. tariffs on their exports. Since AGOA was enacted in the year 2000, trade with beneficiary countries has more than tripled, with U.S. direct investment growing more than sixfold in that time.

This program has helped create more than a million jobs in Sub-Saharan Africa. I worked with my colleagues on the Committee on Finance to craft reauthorization language that will improve on AGOA's past success, to remove obstacles to trade in Sub-Saharan Africa and allow both that region and our job creators here at home to benefit from expanded market access.

I share many of my colleagues' belief that benefits under AGOA should go to countries making good-faith progress toward meeting the program's eligibility criteria. For example, I am very concerned that officers in the Republic of South Africa recently indicated they will attempt to renegotiate commitments made under the General Agreement on Trade in Services to require foreign-owned companies to relinquish 51 percent ownership and control to South Africans.

South Africa also developed a draft policy that proposed changes to intellectual property rights laws which contained significant shortcomings, including inadequate protections for patents, trademarks, and copyrights. These are three areas I take a tremendous interest in, among so many other things around here. I hope very much that as they redraft this policy, it will include recognition of how important protection of intellectual property is to supporting economic growth.

But it is not just South Africa. For example, I understand other beneficiaries under the program continue to impose barriers and limitations to cross-border data flow or otherwise limit digital trade. Because of these concerns, we thought it was important to create a mechanism under the AGOA Program which would allow for benefits to be scaled back if a country is found to not be making good-faith progress on these and other issues. That new tool is included in the bill, and we expect the administration to

use this tool aggressively, particularly in the case of South Africa.

The legislation also includes new consultation and notification requirements, keeping Congress informed of beneficiaries' progress.

There are new mechanisms for stakeholders to petition the administration to raise awareness about potential eligibility violations. The bill will require these petitions to be taken into account when determinations are made regarding a beneficiary's status and in regular reporting.

I know the AGOA Program has a lot of support here in Congress among Members of both parties. I think we were able to craft a bill that not only provides for the long-term extension of the program the administration was seeking but also responds to some very serious bilateral trade challenges we are facing today. With these changes, we have created a more flexible program we believe will spur greater development and economic integration and opportunity in the region, while better serving the needs of our job creators here at home. I believe it deserves strong support.

Finally, the preferences bill would also extend preferential access to the U.S. market for Haiti. Haiti is one of the poorest economies in the Western Hemisphere. The Haiti preference program supports well-paying, stable jobs in a country saddled with poverty and unemployment. I hope this extension will encourage continued economic development and support democracy in Haiti.

This is a strong preferences bill. I expect a strong vote in favor of passing it later today.

Next, the Senate will vote on the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, which includes important provisions to reauthorize and modernize the operations of Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, and significantly improve intellectual property rights protection in the United States and around the world.

The Customs bill will facilitate the efficient movement of merchandise destined for the United States by formalizing in statute programs such as the Centers of Excellence and Expertise. It will also ensure that U.S. customs and trade laws are uniformly implemented nationwide and help ensure that the private sector and CBP work together.

With this bill, we will also ensure that the automated commercial environment and the international data system are completed so that trade documentation can finally be submitted electronically and importers will no longer be required to submit the same information to numerous government agencies.

In addition, the bill will modernize the drawback process by moving from a labor-intensive paper-based system to an electronic claims process that will significantly free up resources in the private and the public sector, and it

will increase the de minimis level from \$200 to \$800, reducing needless burdens on small businesses importing into the United States.

Additionally, the bill strengthens our trade remedy laws and our ability to respond to imports that pose a threat to the health or safety of U.S. consumers.

When drafting this customs legislation, I was particularly interested in beefing up our enforcement of intellectual property rights. The bill includes the strongest possible provisions with regard to intellectual property rights and intellectual property rights enforcement. For example, our bill will establish in law the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center to coordinate Federal efforts to prevent intellectual property violations. It will also significantly expand CBP's tools and authorities to protect intellectual property rights at the border by requiring CBP to share information about suspected infringing merchandise with rights holders.

Our bill will provide CBP with explicit authority to seize and forfeit devices that violate the Digital Millennium Copyright Act—an act I put through a number of years ago—and require CBP to share information with rights holders who are injured by these unlawful devices.

The bill contains provisions to establish a process for CBP to enforce copyrights while registration with the copyright office is pending and to significantly improve CBP's reporting requirements to hold the Agency more accountable for its enforcement efforts with regard to intellectual property.

The bill will strengthen CBP's targeting of goods that violate intellectual property rights, improve CBP's cooperation with the private sector and with foreign customs authorities on enforcement, and require an educational campaign at the border. I am particularly fond of that last part. At my insistence, the bill includes provisions that will require all versions of the Customs Declaration Form that everyone fills out when they enter the United States to contain a warning that importation of goods that infringe on intellectual property rights may violate criminal and/or civil law and may pose serious risks to health and safety. I am not sure most Americans appreciate the danger that counterfeit products can pose, as they often are not built to the same standard of the protected product. So I hope making people more aware of these dangers will help us make sure we are doing all we can to keep Americans safe.

In addition to enhancing protection at our borders, our Customs bill will provide USTR with additional tools to improve the protection of intellectual property rights by our trading partners overseas in order to stop infringing goods at the source. For example, the bill will establish a chief innovation and intellectual property negotiator, with the rank of ambassador, to ensure

that intellectual property rights protection is at the forefront of our trade negotiation and enforcement efforts and to enhance USTR's accountability to Congress on these issues. On top of that, the bill will give USTR more tools to increase enforcement for trade secrets and to ensure that countries that consistently fail to protect intellectual property meet specified benchmarks for improvement.

I am a big fan of this bill. It includes a number of my top trade enforcement priorities, and I am very glad we will get a chance to vote on it today. Of course, it is not perfect. Some of the amendments that were added in committee leave me with some reservations. Most notably, the bill now contains provisions that purport to deal with currency manipulation that are, in my view, very problematic. One provision sets up an avenue for a countervailing duty investigation or review to determine whether some measure of a currency manipulation is effectively a subsidy, either "directly or indirectly" to a country's exports. If the government finds that the manipulation is, once again, either "directly or indirectly," an export subsidy, sanctions can follow. This provision is problematic for a number of reasons.

First of all, it is likely not compliant with our existing international trade commitments. It would effectively require the imposition of trade sanctions that, under the language of the legislation, could be based on presumptions without support. And it will almost certainly invite retaliatory trade sanctions from our trading partners, who will argue, and in fact have already argued, that actions taken by the Federal Reserve Board constitute currency manipulation.

While the authors of the currency manipulation provision in the Customs bill may believe that there is a clear delineation between monetary policies used primarily for domestic economic stabilization and policies used to gain a trade advantage, there is not.

When Japan engages in quantitative easing to boost its economy and inflation expectations, sometimes at the very urging of U.S. officials, is that manipulation?

When the Federal Reserve engages in quantitative easing, with part of the expected benefit being downward exchange rate pressure and boosted exports, is that manipulation, or just domestic stabilization?

Is Germany's persistent trade surplus somehow partially caused by ongoing quantitative easing activities at the European Central Bank?

And, with respect to detection, despite the intent of the authors of this provision, accuracy is evidently not a concern.

I am sure that everyone—or at least those who support this provision—has looked at the recent exchange rate assessments for 2013 from the International Monetary Fund External Sector Report.

For Japan, one IMF method suggested 15-percent yen overvaluation, while another method suggested 15-percent undervaluation. Yet under the currency manipulation provision in this bill, IMF models and methods are what we are supposed to use to set trade sanctions.

For South Korea, the two IMF methodologies suggested undervaluation between around 7 percent and 20 percent. So when we want to set a punitive countervailing duty, what are our authorities supposed to do? Should they assume that South Korea benefited from currency undervaluation of 7 percent or 20 percent or some random number in between? Who knows.

This provision, unfortunately, simply won't work, since it assumes the existence of accurate knowledge and abilities to determine some fundamental equilibrium exchange rates that the IMF and the economics profession simply do not have.

Under the questionable provision of the bill that allows for investigation of currency undervaluation and potential ensuing trade actions, I believe the authors of the provision were overly heroic and mistaken in their belief about the precision of currency valuation methodology. The provision would appeal to models and methodologies, as described in IMF documents.

The problem is that even the IMF does not use those models and methodologies to make definitive judgments about appropriate currency values, which are inherently some of the most difficult things for economic models to identify. It would not be difficult for our trading partners to use precisely the same models and methodologies to make countervailing cases against Federal Reserve monetary policy, resulting in retaliatory trade sanctions and perhaps defensive currency interventions.

This is a clear road to trade wars and currency wars replete with competitive devaluations. Such a road is paved by the offending provision in the Customs bill, which basically gives our trading partners a template for their own accusations about currency manipulation and ensuing trade sanctions. This is problematic.

And while Senators in this Chamber would like to simply decree that our monetary policies are just domestic economic stabilization, while foreign monetary policies that may look similar are manipulation, such self-evaluations will not be acceptable in international trade and agreements.

I understand the desire among many of my colleagues to address currency manipulation, and I want to work with them on this issue. But I am convinced that the currency manipulation provision in the Customs bill simply will not work, and, when tried, it will simply give ammunition to our trading partners to consider engagement in trade wars, currency wars, competitive devaluations, and beggar-thy-neighbor monetary policies. This isn't what we

should be shooting for with our Nation's trade policy.

In addition to the currency language, there was another provision added during the markup that would require employers to report occupational classification data to State agencies when filing their quarterly wage reports. This is an entirely new burden that would be placed on employers throughout the country, added to all the other reporting burdens they already face, and would require brand new systems for reporting and collecting information. And in the end, it is not readily apparent just how valuable this new collected information will be.

According to CBO, this new requirement would cost employers throughout the country more than \$200 million between 2016 and 2020. Now, that may not seem like much compared to the numbers that get thrown around here in the Senate. But when we are talking about small businesses who struggle from month to month to cover their payrolls, it is a burden that, at least to me, doesn't appear to be necessary.

So once again, I am concerned about this provision and the impact it might have. However, despite the reservations I have about the flawed currency manipulation concepts and language and the unfunded mandate on employers, I believe it is important that we vote to move the Customs bill forward. Overall, this is a very good bill. A lot of work has gone into it, and I know that it reflects the priorities of a number of our colleagues and Members here in the Senate, including myself. That being the case, I plan to vote in favor of passing this legislation later on today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Once again, I am very glad to see that we are making progress on moving these bills through the Senate. I wish to thank all of my colleagues—particularly those on the Finance Committee—who worked so hard on these bills to get them to this point.

These are important votes we are going to take today. I expect that both of these bills will receive broad bipartisan support, and I hope they will.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE AMTRAK
TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I address the matter at hand, I want to say that our hearts go out to the families of the men and women who lost their lives as a result of the Amtrak derailment last Tuesday. There are many still fighting injuries, and our thoughts and prayers are with them and their loved ones.

This was a commuter train. I have ridden it personally hundreds of times,

and it is one my colleagues have ridden.

It was a train full of people on their way home—to their families, to their loved ones, to the things they like to do. So our thoughts go out to all of them.

It will be our job as lawmakers to analyze why this happened, how we could have prevented it, and how we can best move forward to ensure such a tragedy is not repeated. Some of this is already underway. But the more pressing task in this moment of tragedy is for us to show solidarity with the victims and their families, and recognize their contributions—however large or small—to our national story.

New York lost a few native sons and daughters:

Abid Gilani, a senior vice president of Wells Fargo and a father of two.

Rachel Jacobs, an industry leader in her field, was heading home to her husband and 2-year-old son as CEO of a new job at an educational software company.

Jim Gaines, a software architect for the Associated Press, a beloved member of the staff, who was heading home to Plainsboro, NJ, to see his wife, 16-year-old son, and 11-year-old daughter.

We lost Dr. Derrick Griffith, a dean of student affairs at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, just a stone's throw away from where I live. He spent his entire adult life working to improve urban education.

And we lost a young man named Justin Zemser, who lived in Rockaway, in my old congressional district, and was studying at the U.S. Naval Academy. He was a tremendous young man—and I know that because I nominated him to the Naval Academy.

He was a valedictorian, an earnest big brother and mentor to two children with autism, as well as being captain of the varsity football team. His family mourns his loss and so does America. He would have done so much for our country.

Today, let us remember them. Tomorrow, let us work together so that their loss is not in vain.

Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Customs bill before this body, particularly because of the strong language it contains on the crackdown on currency manipulation.

I have spoken many times on this subject in the Finance Committee and here on the floor because I am passionate about finally passing enforceable mechanisms for dealing with this malicious trade tactic. Why? Because I am deeply concerned by the plight of the middle class in today's economy, where globalization and free-trade agreements have accelerated a downward pressure on middle-class wages and forced entire industries to relocate to low-wage countries.

And I believe currency manipulation is one of the most significant emerging trade challenges this country faces, because it directly impacts wages and it directly impacts jobs.

As this Congress is soon to reengage on a fast-track for a massive free-trade agreement, now is the time to think deeply and comprehensively about our country's trade policy and how it impacts the broad middle of our economy.

To me and many of my colleagues, it does not make sense to move forward on the one hand with a blank check for free trade without passing strong worker protections on a parallel track. The global economy is a rough sea. We should not pass a trade package that forces the American worker to navigate those waters with a leaky boat and a deflated lifejacket.

So to me and to many of my colleagues, this Customs bill and the currency manipulation issue is unquestionably germane to the larger debate on trade. If the goal of TPP is to lure countries away from China, it makes perfect sense that, as part of the overall effort with TPP, we also go after Chinese currency manipulation, as well.

But beyond the question of relevance to this debate—which I believe is dispatched easily—this bill is substantively good trade policy. It contains several smart, balanced, effective measures to create a level playing field with our international trading partners.

First and foremost, currency manipulation is finally attacked head-on. Companies have asked me about this. CEOs of major companies have said to me: We cannot compete if we have one hand tied behind our back, which currency manipulation does.

Mr. President, may I ask my colleague a question, the ranking member?

How much time do you wish?

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague. I will be very brief.

Mr. SCHUMER. How much time is left for the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Seven?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would you please notify me when I have taken 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Big companies have been hurt. Small companies have been hurt. We have lost millions of jobs because of currency manipulation, which makes the exports from China and other countries about 33 percent cheaper and imports from America to China 33 percent more expensive.

I would say this: China seems to feel they can get away with any kind of trade misdeed, whether it is stealing intellectual property by cyber security or any other means, whether it is keeping out the best of American products, which they do until they can learn how to make them themselves in their protected market and then fight us everywhere else.

This currency bill will finally be the first real shot across the bow to China that you cannot keep getting away

from it. Their unfair trade practices hurt us in low-wage industries that were very important—shoes, clothing, toys, furniture. Those industries have already suffered. But if we do nothing, it will be the cream of American industry where our innovation and hard work is lost to China through unfair means, currency and other, whether it is tech or pharmaceuticals. Talk to the CEOs of these companies, and they will tell you China does not play fair. Talk to them, and they will tell you that the Chinese shrug their shoulders at what we have done up until now. We must do something—if not in the TPA bill, alongside it—that shows China once and for all they cannot get away with it. I fear that if we do not, in 10 years we will be saying the same thing about the industries that we say today. The customs measure, currency measure is bipartisan. The currency measure passed our committee with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 18 to 8, and was supported by our ranking member, which I most appreciate. It passed the Senate in 2011 with 63 votes. It passed the House of Representatives with 348 votes. And a year and a half ago, in 2013, 60 Senators sent a letter to the President imploring the inclusion of enforceable currency provisions.

In conclusion, we have to think about the big picture when it comes to trade policy. If we move the ledger on one side, opening up our markets in foreign markets, we better make sure we adequately move the ledger on the other side to protect our workers, curb unfair deceptive practices, and give our small businesses the ability to compete in a global economy.

The fate of middle-class wages, middle-class jobs, and the very economy of this country hang in the balance. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I wish to also note that Senator SCHUMER has provided leadership on another very important enforcement issue. He introduced the committee to something a number of years ago known as honey laundering. What this involved was, in effect, we set up a sting operation. In particular, with respect to Senator SCHUMER's constituents and his interest in tough enforcement of the trade laws, the Chinese, as my colleagues will recall, were found guilty of unfair trading practices. In effect, they would just ship honey through other countries, such as Indonesia.

I want my colleague to know I am going to continue to work with him on a variety of issues.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. If I might, I thank the Senator for the great job he has done under very difficult circumstances. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle appreciates Senator WYDEN's intelligence, his bipartisanship, and his steadfastness.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Senator.

I am going to wrap up as we move to this first vote in a few minutes and come back to what this debate is all about. We are starting, of course, with the issue of trade enforcement, but the big challenge is to show this country that we are putting in place a modern trade policy, a trade policy that sets aside once and for all the NAFTA playbook of the 1990s. This overall package will usher in a new and modern American trade policy. It must start with a tough, robust, effective trade enforcement package, many of the details of which I have outlined here this morning.

It is time also—and this will be part of our early work—to upgrade and renew our trade preference programs. The businesses and workers who rely on these programs are waiting for this Congress to act.

The first of these proposals enhances and extends the African Growth and Opportunity Act, referred to as AGOA. This has been the core of a close economic partnership between our country and a host of African nations for more than a decade. The proposal before the Senate will update that partnership in a way that is positive for all involved.

Back in the 1990s—once again returning to this theme, the NAFTA era—the United States had no meaningful trade policies to help African nations facing profound economic hardship climb back from the brink. This renewal of the AGOA law takes the program to the next level. AGOA will be simpler for businesses to use. There will be less redtape to worry about. African countries will be encouraged to zero in on strategies that can make the program more effective. It will be easier for the United States to crack down on the bad actors and verify that countries stay strictly in line with the criteria for eligibility. Most importantly, the proposal gives all concerned—workers, businesses, countries, and investors—a decade of certainty.

I am a real fan of this program. I believe it works for our country, for Sub-Saharan Africa, and it ought to be a cornerstone of our economic policy in the region.

The second part of this package of programs renews the program known as the generalized system of preferences. This is an economic win-win because it is a shot in the arm for developing countries, and it is a major boost for American manufacturers, including hundreds of them in my home State. One of those businesses in Oregon is Stackhouse Athletic in Salem, which will not only be able to create new jobs, they will be able to offer health benefits to their workers.

The extension of GSP will save American businesses an estimated \$2 million a day by reducing tariffs. The GSP program expired nearly 2 years ago. As a result, businesses in my home State of Oregon paid an extra \$4.9 million in tariffs. Renewing GSP would correct that issue and support as many

as 80,000 jobs with manufacturers, ports, farmers, and retail stores. That program would be extended by this legislation through 2017.

Finally, the Senate has an opportunity with this legislation to reaffirm our economic commitment to Haiti, one of our closest and most disadvantaged neighbors in the world. In my view, Senator NELSON of Florida has done very important work in this area. He has been our leader on this issue, and there is bipartisan understanding that now is the right time to extend the Haiti trade preferences to line them up with AGOA. These Haiti preferences also did not exist in the NAFTA era. Together, they support as many as 30,000 jobs in that country, and they help to drive investment and lift Haiti's economy in the long term.

I am confident the Senate will come together to extend this package of preference programs because they make economic sense for America, and they strengthen our ties with the developing countries around the world.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation with our first vote.

I will close by saying that today we begin to turn the corner on a fresh, modern trade policy for the times, a policy very different from the trade policy of the 1990s, the NAFTA era. Let's begin this effort—begin this effort—for a new 21st-century trade policy by passing the legislation we will be considering shortly, both parts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will now read the bills, as amended, for the third time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bills to be read a third time.

The bills were read the third time.

VOTE ON H.R. 1295

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 1295, pass?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Franken	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Reid
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Heller	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Scott
Casey	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	

NAYS—1

Lankford

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy

Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, H.R. 1295, as amended, is passed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

VOTE ON H.R. 644

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 644, pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Ayotte	Collins	Hoeven
Baldwin	Coons	Isakson
Barrasso	Crapo	Kaine
Bennet	Donnelly	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Kirk
Blunt	Enzi	Klobuchar
Booker	Ernst	Lankford
Boozman	Feinstein	Leahy
Boxer	Fischer	Manchin
Brown	Franken	Markey
Burr	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Cantwell	Graham	McConnell
Capito	Grassley	Menendez
Cardin	Hatch	Merkley
Carper	Heinrich	Mikulski
Casey	Heitkamp	Murkowski
Cochran	Hirono	Murphy

Murray	Roberts	Tester
Nelson	Rounds	Thune
Paul	Sanders	Udall
Perdue	Schatz	Vitter
Peters	Schumer	Warner
Portman	Scott	Warren
Reed	Sessions	Whitehouse
Reid	Shaheen	Wicker
Risch	Stabenow	Wyden

NAYS—20

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Coats	Gardner	Rubio
Corker	Heller	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy	Sullivan
---------	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, H.R. 644, as amended, is passed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER CLOTURE VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote on which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 is agreed to.

Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

MR. HATCH. Madam President, soon the Senate will vote once again on whether to begin debate on legislation that will help shape the future of America's trade policy, and, in addition, our role in the global economy. Needless to say, I was very disappointed when many of my Democratic colleagues voted to block debate on these important issues earlier this week. I am hoping for a much different result this afternoon.

This vote will set the stage for an important debate, quite likely the most significant debate that we will have in this Chamber all year. This debate will determine whether our Nation is willing and able to accept the challenges of the world economy or whether we continue in retreat and yield to the siren song of isolationism and protectionism.

It will determine whether we, as a nation, are able and willing to take the lead in setting the rules for the world economy or whether we will sit on the sidelines and let other countries create the rules that will govern trade in their regions for the foreseeable future. It should be pretty clear where I stand in this debate.

I support free trade and open markets for U.S. exporters and job creators. I support new opportunities for American farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, service providers, and the workers that they all employ. I support expanding American influence in the

most vibrant and strategic regions in the world. The best way for Congress to help our country achieve these goals is to renew trade promotion authority, or TPA, as soon as possible.

That is what we will be debating, if this vote goes the way I hope it will. TPA is the most effective tool in the Congress's trade arsenal. TPA ensures that Congress sets the objectives for our trade negotiators and that those negotiators will be able to reach the best deals possible. Without TPA we have no way of holding the administration accountable in trade negotiations and no way of making sure our country can get a good deal.

Getting TPA renewed is currently President Obama's top legislative priority. He is right and we should support our President on this issue.

As chairman of the Senate committee with jurisdiction over trade, it is a very high priority for me, as well. The TPA bill that will be brought before the Senate represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort to advance our Nation's trade interests.

The legislation we will be debating will also include provisions to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, which I know is a high priority for many of my colleagues. It has taken a long time, a lot of work, and no small amount of compromise to get us to this point. People from both parties have put in enormous efforts just to get a chance to have this debate here on the Senate floor.

I want to thank my colleagues for their work thus far in this effort, but also to remind them that we are not there yet. Now, I am well aware that not all of my colleagues share my views on trade. I expect that they will make those views abundantly clear in the coming days, as they should. But to do that, we need to begin that debate. I am looking forward to it. The American people deserve a spirited debate on these issues.

Of course, they deserve an opportunity to see this Chamber function like the great deliberative body that it once was and under the current leadership is becoming again. Put simply, the obstruction has gone on long enough. It is time to get down to the serious business of legislating. I hope we can begin or continue that process today by voting in favor of the motion to proceed. I encourage all of my colleagues to do that so that we can get on this bill, debate it, have a full-fledged debate, and let the chips fall where they may.

If we do, I think we will all feel a lot better about what goes on around this place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. PERDUE.) The Senator from Vermont.

MR. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me respectfully disagree with my friend from Utah. Let me urge all Members to vote against what I believe to be a disastrous trade agreement, a trade agreement based on other trade agreements,

which, in fact, have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs and have led to a race to the bottom.

Let me just briefly give four reasons—and there are many more. But let me just focus on four objective reasons why we should defeat this fast-track legislation and why we need to develop a whole new approach to trade that benefits American workers rather than just the CEOs of large multinational corporations.

Reason No. 1, this unfettered free-trade agreement with Vietnam, Malaysia, and 10 other countries follows in the footsteps of disastrous trade agreements such as NAFTA, CAFTA, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, and the South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Any objective look at these trade agreements will tell us that they have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs and have led us to a race to the bottom, where American workers are forced to compete against workers in low-wage countries who are making pennies an hour.

Over and over again, supporters of these types of trade agreements have told us about how many jobs they would create, how beneficial it would be for the middle class and working class of this country. But over and over again, virtually everything they told us turned out to be wrong, and they are wrong again in terms of the TPP.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton promised that NAFTA would create 1 million American jobs in 5 years. Instead, NAFTA has led to the loss of almost 700,000 jobs. In 1999, we were promised that Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China would open the Chinese economy to American-made goods and services. Instead, as everybody who goes shopping knows—when you buy product after product made in China—that trade agreement has cost us some 2.7 million American jobs. I remember hearing all the accolades about free trade with China. They all turned out to be wrong.

In 2011, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce told us that the South Korea Free Trade Agreement would create some 280,000 jobs. Well, wrong again—instead, that agreement has led to the loss of some 75,000 jobs.

The reason for all of this is very simple. Why would an American corporation invest in this country, pay American workers 15, 18, 20 bucks an hour, provide health care, have to obey environmental regulations, and deal with trade unions, when they can go abroad, pay people pennies an hour, and not have to worry about the environment. That is, of course, what has happened.

These trade agreements have failed. TPP is based on these principles. It will be another failure. We should reject it for that reason.

Second point, in politics it is always interesting and important to know whose side different groups are on. You can learn a lot by who is supporting an agreement and by who is opposing the agreement.